



☐ EPA/EPO/OEB
D-80298 München
☎ +49 89 2399-0
TX 523 656 epmu d
FAX +49 89 2399-4465

Europäisches
Patentamt

European
Patent Office

Office européen
des brevets

Generaldirektion 2

Directorate General 2

Direction Générale 2

Schoppe, Fritz, Dipl.-Ing.
Patentanwälte Schoppe, Zimmermann,
Stöckeler & Zinkler,
Postfach 246
82043 Pullach bei München
ALLEMAGNE

Telephone numbers:

Primary Examiner
(Substantive examination) +49 89 2399-2249

Formalities Officer / Assistant
(Formalities and other matters) +49 89 2399-7273



Application No. 03 026 574.8 - 2220	Ref. MT031103PEP	Date 10.08.2004
Applicant Murata Manufacturing Co., Ltd.		

Communication pursuant to Article 96(2) EPC

The examination of the above-identified application has revealed that it does not meet the requirements of the European Patent Convention for the reasons enclosed herewith. If the deficiencies indicated are not rectified the application may be refused pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

You are invited to file your observations and insofar as the deficiencies are such as to be rectifiable, to correct the indicated deficiencies within a period

of 4 months

from the notification of this communication, this period being computed in accordance with Rules 78(2) and 83(2) and (4) EPC.

One set of amendments to the description, claims and drawings is to be filed within the said period on separate sheets (Rule 36(1) EPC).

Failure to comply with this invitation in due time will result in the application being deemed to be withdrawn (Article 96(3) EPC).



FRISTENDE	20.12.04	SB
VOR- 1.	10.12.04	SB
FRIST 2.		
ERLEDIGT		

KALEVE A
Primary Examiner
for the Examining Division

Enclosure(s): 2 page/s reasons (Form 2906)



Bescheid/Protokoll (Anlage)

Communication/Minutes (Annex)

Notification/Procès-verbal (Annexe)

Datum
Date
Date

10.08.2004

Blatt
Sheet
Feuille

1

Anmelde-Nr.:

Application No.:

Demande n°:

03 026 574.8

The examination is being carried out on the following application documents:

Text for the Contracting States:

AT BE BG CH CY CZ DE DK EE ES FI FR GB GR HU IE IT LU MC NL PT RO SE SI SK TR LI

Description, pages:

1-17 as originally filed

Claims, No.:

1-17 as originally filed

Drawings, sheets:

1/13-13/13 as originally filed

1. It is clear from the description that the following features are essential to the definition of the invention:

- (1) each center electrode is insulated from the other center electrodes
- (2) side electrodes on side surface of the ferrite; each thicker end portion being connected to a corresponding side electrode
- (3) each thicker end portion being **directly** connected to a corresponding side electrode (the word 'connected' without 'directly' also includes connected through several other devices)

Since independent claim 1 does not contain features (1) and (3), and independent claim 13 does not contain features (2) and (3), the claims do not meet the requirement following from Article 84 EPC taken in combination with Rules 29(1) and (3) EPC that any independent claim must contain all the technical features essential to the definition of the invention.

In addition, claims 1 and 13 do not fulfill the requirements of Article 82 EPC, because they fail to correspond to each other, meaning that all features being essential to the definition of the invention are comprised in both the entity and the method claim.

2. The statements in the description on page 16, first two sentences of paragraph 3 and the last paragraph continuing on page 17 imply that the subject-matter for



Bescheid/Protokoll (Anlage)

Communication/Minutes (Annex)

Notification/Procès-verbal (Annexe)

Datum
Date
Date

10.08.2004

Blatt
Sheet
Feuille

2

Anmelde-Nr.:
Application No.:
Demande n°:

03 026 574.8

which protection is sought may be different to that defined by the claims, thereby resulting in lack of clarity of the claims (Article 84 EPC) when used to interpret them (see the Guidelines, C-III, 4.3a). These statements should therefore be amended to remove this inconsistency.

3. Rule 27 (1)(c) EPC is not fulfilled, since a method according to claim 13 is not mentioned in the respective description part "Summary of the invention".
4. The unit 'inches' expressed on page 6 does not meet the requirements of Rule 35(12) EPC and should be replaced by the appropriate SI unit (cf. the Guidelines, C-II, Annex 1). The present expression should, however, be retained in parentheses after the replacement expression.
5. In addition, the following points are to be noted:
 - (i) the new independent claims should be cast in correct two-part form (Rule 29(1) EPC) with respect to D1;
 - (ii) reference signs in parentheses should be inserted in the claims (Rule 29(7) EPC);
 - (iii) when filing amended claims the applicant should at the same time bring the description into conformity with the amended claims (Rule 27(1)(c) EPC);
 - (iv) in order to facilitate the examination of the conformity of the amended application with the requirements of Article 123(2) EPC, the applicant is requested to clearly identify the amendments carried out, irrespective of whether they concern amendments by addition, replacement or deletion, and to indicate the passages of the application as filed on which these amendments are based.